THEOLOGY

VOL. LX NOVEMBER, 1957 No. 449

Editorial

THE most interesting—we do not say, the most important—of the so far published Reports that will be considered by the Lambeth Conference next year is that on *The Commemoration of Saints and Heroes of the Faith in the Anglican Communion* (S.P.C.K., 6s.). It has been produced by a small commission that was appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and presided over by the Dean of York, signs of whose chairmanship are more visible in some sections of the Report than in others. It seems probable that different chapters were at least drafted by different hands: not only are there variations of style but in the last two chapters there is a contradiction of recommendation.[1] But the Report as a whole is a most instructive and informative introduction to the question of recognizing saints as it concerns the Anglican Communion, and indeed we think it deserves to be studied by other Christian bodies as well. At the outset the point is well made that the recognizing of saints must not conflict with the teaching and reticences of Scripture, but that "reasonable and reverent deductions" about the state of the departed and the communion of saints are permissible and to some extent inevitable, and as the Report gathers momentum one is led to warmer and more positive conclusions. The stages by which the commemoration of particular saints developed in both the West and the East are traced. As regards the Eastern Orthodox Churches, the article in this number of THEOLOGY by Mr Allchin (which was written before the Report appeared) supplies additional and more up-to-date information, since he has drawn upon sources which apparently escaped the attention of the members of the Commission.

Most readers will be much surprised to learn in detail how various and extensive are the steps that have been taken during this century in most parts of the Anglican Communion to enlarge and enrich the Church's recognition of, and ways of commemorating, heroes of the faith. There is no evidence here to support Mr Allchin's apprehension that "there are doubtless some members of the Church of England who feel that any commemoration of post-Biblical Christians is unnecessary or even dangerous": the only testimony to a purely nega-

[1] On pp. 67 f. a preference is expressed for "one kalendar, containing comparatively few names, which is common to a whole province, a group of provinces, or possibly to the whole (Anglican) Communion", to which "there should be provincial and diocesan supplements with some special provision for more local observance", whereas on p. 69 we are told that "the total list of names in any provincial or diocesan kalendar can rightly be more ample than the single parish requires, since it expresses the corporate witness of the whole diocese or province".

tive attitude comes from "the Bishop of Jerusalem" (*sic*) who notes, with regret, that "in most churches in this bishopric we have not yet been able to persuade them to take any notice of saints' days at all, even the red-letter days of our existing Kalendar" (p. 62). What emerges from a contemporary survey of the Anglican Communion is that there is a general movement towards a larger recognition of saints and that this movement has been spontaneously acquiring common features of which the Lambeth Conference ought certainly to take cognizance.

It seems a pity that by its terms of reference the Commission was prevented from considering the question of including the names of Christians outside the Anglican Communion in revised kalendars. The Report does however note that overseas provinces have in some cases already done this. We could wish that the Church of England, as the national church in this country, would go before the English Catholic and Protestant dissenters and give kalendrical recognition to saints whom they have produced but are, for one reason or another, inhibited from recognizing as such, e.g. Richard Challoner and John and Charles Wesley.

* * * * *

In this number there will be found the first of a series of articles on Biblical Commentaries, which will appear from time to time during the next few years. The object of the articles will be to supply information and guidance about the commentaries that are available on different books (or groups of books) in the Bible. A distinction will be drawn between commentaries designed for the general reader on the English text and those that are based on the original language or are in other ways intended for more specialist or advanced students.

* * * * *

The Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford calls attention to the fact that, in view of the lack of suitable candidates, it appears that the Abbott's Scholarships which are open to the sons or daughters of clergymen of the Church of England are not so well known as they might be. These scholarships of £50 per annum are supplementable by the Ministry of Education, so that they are financially indistinguishable from ordinary open scholarships. Abbott's Scholarships, to be taken up in October 1958, will be available at the following Oxford Colleges: St Anne's, St Hugh's, St Catherine's, St Peter's Hall, Wadham, Worcester, Lincoln, Lady Margaret Hall and Keble. Further information can be had on application to any of these Colleges.

* * * * *

Since the question has been raised, it can be stated that the "Letter from Cyprus" in the September number of THEOLOGY was not written by any of the clergy serving in Cyprus.

National Service and the Ordinand

SINCE 1945 almost all younger ordinands have either seen active service with the armed forces or have spent two years on National Service. The fact that National Service is coming to an end poses a question for all who are concerned with the training of ordinands. Has the experience of National Service been of such value in helping ordinands to measure up to the demands of the ordained life that the bishops should require some comparable substitute as a necessary part of a man's training?

We should perhaps remind ourselves that National Service was not devised by the Church as a means of securing for ordinands a wider experience of life! If certain advantages have accrued from the period of conscription such advantages have been by-products. As Sir John Wolfenden's committee expresses it: "Since National Service exists to enable the nation to meet its military commitments, the preferences and experience of the individual must come second, though they are obviously relevant and important both from his point of view and also with reference to maximum efficiency in the use of manpower." Ordinands have been called up in the same way as their contemporaries. The bishops decided that it was right for ordinands to share the national duty and have not therefore asked for deferment until ordination, which would in effect have resulted in exemption. Obvious as this is, it needs to be said, as some speakers in their eagerness to make a virtue of necessity have tended to forget the necessity and to exaggerate the virtue.

The fact that not all was well was evidenced by the unusual decision of the Army Council to set up a Committee of Inquiry composed of three impartial lay observers. The Report of this "Committee on the Employment of National Service men in the United Kingdom" (Cmnd 35), from which I have already quoted, was presented to Parliament in December 1956 and exposed a number of defects and disadvantages.

When we try to weigh up the advantages and disadvantages of National Service to ordinands we find it hard to strike a balance, since so much depends on the quality of the individual man and the luck of his postings. But in general, after conversations with many ordinands, it can fairly be said that almost every man would claim that, granted the necessity, it had been a worthwhile and maturing experience. For the majority it was their first time away from home, and in spite of many wasted hours and boring occupations they could not avoid meeting all sorts in the barrack room and were made aware of attitudes very different from their own. These positive gains, however, might in other circumstances have been gathered in a considerably shorter period than two years.

Perhaps the most significant value for the Church of the period of National Service lies in the fact that many men say that it was in the Forces that they first really discovered what Christian Faith and the Church meant to them. A considerable number decided to offer

themselves for ordination during this period: the influence of Service Chaplains has been considerable. We must go forward in faith that in the future those men who seem to have needed the jolt of the call-up to make them aware that God was calling them to the Ministry, will make the discovery none the less. Schoolboy conferences will have an increased importance.

But the advantages of National Service for ordinands can be exaggerated. The value of the experience depends on the use the individual makes of it. Many seem to have insulated themselves against service life: postings near home and regular week-end leave have diminished the value of the changed way of life. By no means all *reflect* on what they see and hear, and therefore they fail to derive the benefit they might have derived from observing the attitudes to life and religion of their contemporaries. Only a few seem to approach the study of theology with the kind of questions we might have expected after barrack-room conversations.

In many respects these two years in parenthesis have a bad effect on their potentiality as students: men get out of the habit of study: the edge of their minds becomes blunted. One freshman told me that his greatest difficulty was to settle to study in the evenings when for two years he had regarded 6 p.m. as his freedom hour, after which he could do what he liked. National Service tends also to build up an irresponsible attitude to the use of time, and students consequently tend to spend in gossip time which they ought to spend in acquiring knowledge. A subtle, sub-Christian attitude to authority ("we-they") is another legacy from National Service which makes it harder to establish the best teacher-student relationships.

Considerations like these should make us cautious in arguing from the value of National Service to the necessity of a comparable substitute. A substitute would tend to become a rather self-conscious seeking of experience for its own sake, whereas National Service is disinfected of self-consciousness by being a universal requirement for other purposes. Experience, like happiness, is not gained by being sought. It supervenes upon purposive activity and its fruits are harvested by reflection.

We may expect that in the future, as in the present, many will come to a sense of vocation after years spent in teaching or in business or in some other secular occupation. But the ending of National Service will certainly increase the number for whom the normal sequence will be home, school, university, theological college, first parish. What of these men? It may well be that some at least ought to be encouraged as part of their training to enlarge their understanding of the world in which the Church is set. If the Church is to be the priest of humanity it needs to understand the predicament of the men and women whom it represents to God and serves in his name. This is an abiding function of the laity. But in so far as the ordained priest himself is also a representative person within the Church, does he not need to take special steps to understand the men and women he is to represent and serve?

Some would argue that an ordinand cannot enter sufficiently into

the mind, attitudes, assumptions, values of modern men and women unless he spends some period of his life trying to understand their outlook by working, for example, in a factory, earning a weekly pay packet, belonging to a workers' club, to a trade union. Others would argue in reply that compassion born of a true vocation, prayer, the wise direction of a first vicar, reading, taking the trouble to find out how parishioners earn their living, etc., are all that is needed to enable a young priest to get right alongside people in their infinite individuality as well as their common need.

There is truth in both contentions: and because we cannot generalize, neither can we legislate for the purpose of giving men the best kind of experience for the exercise of the ordained ministry. All who have a hand in training ordinands need to keep before their students the double need of understanding theology and of understanding men and women in their social environment. The more imaginative and compassionate ordinands will reach out for every opportunity of increasing their understanding. Others will perhaps need rather more prodding by their advisers. Much could be achieved during vacations, as, for example, by using the opportunities provided by short courses such as those sponsored by the William Temple College at Rugby and the Industrial Mission in Sheffield. Some men might be encouraged to live with a working-class family and earn their living for six months in an industrial concern: but in this event it is most desirable that the ordinand should be in touch with a *thinking group* of Christians if he is to be made aware of the problems of industry and derive full benefit from the experience. Others could be encouraged to spend a year studying the post-graduate Social Science Course provided by the London School of Economics—a course which includes practical work with the social services. There are the Family Service Units, part-time day jobs combined with evening club work, lay work in a parish. Certain men might be encouraged to travel abroad, using such facilities as the Philip Usher Scholarship and the scholarships of the World Council of Churches. As time goes on we may hope to see more special courses arranged locally for ordinands and younger clergy, including the study of welfare services, schools, hospitals, trades unions, industrial relationships, together with the social problems, attitudes to religion, secular substitutes for religion, and other influences which press on people in modern cities.

Two needs emerge if this argument is sound: first, that there should be a sufficient number of opportunities of this kind; secondly, that the opportunities should be made known to ordinands both at the university and in the theological college. Opportunities and encouragement to use opportunities as part of a man's training are, I suggest, more likely to result in priests who are alive to the contemporary situation than an attempt on the part of Church authorities to require some kind of secular experience as a necessary qualification for ordination. The forces of secularism, after all, are not far removed from any of us, and what most men need urgently is the ability to discriminate between attitudes that are secular and those that are Christian. The appropriate point in a man's course for some

such project as I have indicated is likely to differ with individuals: some might undertake it between university and theological college; others after G.O.E. and before a final term at college before ordination. But at rock bottom what is being raised is the question: What kind of training is needed to prepare men as adequately as possible for the exercise of the Sacred Ministry in the second half of the twentieth century? This in turn calls for closer integration between pre-ordination and post-ordination training. Post-ordination training is primarily the task of a man's vicar; but it is widely recognized that there is need to supplement this in respect of matters which are more capable of being dealt with at diocesan level. Such training is being given with varying degrees of imagination and success in the dioceses. Does not the ending of National Service call for still further exploration of possibilities of continuing training during the early years of a man's ministry? This article will have achieved a useful purpose if it stimulates discussion.

SYDNEY EVANS.

The Recognition of Saints

No one can feel altogether happy about the present position of the Church of England on the question of the recognition and commemoration of saints. The selection of names for inclusion in the calendar seems somewhat arbitrary, and certainly incomplete. In the Prayer Book of 1928, for instance, Catherine of Siena (d. 1380) is the most modern saint to be found in the calendar. But if the Church is right to commemorate Christians of the first fourteen centuries, it is surely very strange that she should mention no more recent names in her worship. There are doubtless some members of the Church of England who feel that any commemoration of post-biblical Christians is unnecessary or even dangerous, and who consequently must wish for the removal of all the black-letter saints from the calendar. But their position can hardly be representative. The great majority of Anglicans celebrate the memory of at least *some* post-biblical Christians, keep their festivals and dedicate churches in their name. Such is the normal practice of the Church of England, and on the basis of this practice, without going into the disputed issue of the invocation of saints, we wish to ask explicitly a question which is at present the matter of some discussion. Should the Church recognize some of its more recently departed members as "saints", in the traditional sense of the word?

The difficulty over this question arises in the first instance from the lack of any machinery for canonization in the Anglican Communion; and proposals for rectifying our present situation usually take the form of suggestions for making good that deficiency. But the prospect of an official commission sitting to choose names for insertion into the calendar, with all the possibilities of bargaining involved, seems scarcely less artificial than the situation it would be

intended to remedy. Moreover, the current practice of the Roman Catholic Church, with its rigorous and legal methods of inquiry and its insistence on the proof of miracles, is hardly an encouraging or even possible model for Anglican imitation. To find a way out of this impasse we need to go more deeply into the whole question of how saints are recognized for what they are, and to remember that in the early centuries of the Church's history they were not nominated by select committees. We should also notice that the Roman Church need not be our only contemporary source of guidance. To see what the Eastern Orthodox Church at present does about recognizing saints will at least be interesting, and may well prove relevant.

The very existence of modern Orthodox saints is scarcely known in the West. In English we have biographies of two comparatively recent Russian saints, Tikhon Zadonsky (1724–83) and Seraphim of Sarov (1759–1833), and the autobiography of Father John of Cronstadt (1829–1908), regarded by many as a saint.[1] But the process of canonization followed in the Russian Church before the revolution, involving a long inquiry and eventual Imperial approval, itself differed considerably from the practice of earlier ages and of the other Orthodox Churches, and had developed under Latin influence during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Fortunately in Greece to-day we are able to study both in theory and in practice the ways in which a departed Christian becomes recognized as holy and numbered among the saints of God, ways which differ little from the practice of the early Church.

For the theory we may turn to a long article by Professor Alivisatos published in 1948 in *Theologia*, the official theological quarterly of the Greek Church.[2] The title of the article, "The Recognition of Saints in the Orthodox Church", is itself indicative of the author's thesis, for he has chosen to use the word *anagnōrisis*, rather than *anakēruxis*, to describe the process of canonizing a saint, and throughout his article the stress is on the *recognition* by the whole Church of what God has done rather than on its *proclamation* by the hierarchy. Professor Alivisatos begins by describing briefly the practice of the early Church in recognizing and acclaiming saints. He points out that at first popular action was everything, and that only gradually official authorization by the hierarchy came to be regarded as essential. Eastern and Western practice diverged radically, he maintains, in the twelfth century, when in the West the power of canonization was reserved to the Pope alone. In Greece and the Near East, on the other hand, the Church's practice remained substantially

[1] *St Tikhon Zadonsky*, by N. Gorodetsky (1951); *Flame in the Snow*, by Julia de Beausobre (1945); and *My Life in Christ*, by John Sergieff (1897).

[2] *Theologia*, vol. 19, pp. 18-52., cf. also the more recent article on the same subject by the Metropolitan of Serres (*Theologia*, vol. 27, October 1956, pp. 609–15). This article was written as part of the preparatory work on the subjects to be discussed at the projected Panorthodox Prosynod. The Metropolitan, far from disagreeing with Professor Alivisatos, stresses still more the primacy of the popular recognition, and the purely secondary character of the official "canonization".

unchanged both during the middle ages and the centuries of Turkish domination. It is popular recognition which comes first and is essential; official action is secondary. "Consequently," he writes, "there remains unchanged to this day with us the rule and order of the popular recognition by the whole Church, that is to say both clergy and laity, of a certain person as holy; this may be followed by an act of the official ecclesiastical authorities in order to give official ratification to the recognition and to arrange for subsequent liturgical details, but this is not indispensable, and in no case can it precede the popular decision of the conscience of the Church. It can indeed be omitted without any fear of violating canonical order and rendering the recognition void."[1] Professor Alivisatos supports this contention by numerous examples, and especially by the "new martyrs", who suffered for their faith during the sixteenth to nineteenth centuries. Most of them have local cults which have never received any synodical sanction.

Just how far the initiative of private members of the Church may go in this matter can be seen from the following quotation: "It is worth special notice that the *akolouthiai* (offices) of the saints, and even the *sunaxaria* (accounts of their lives), . . . were not subject to official ecclesiastical intervention either beforehand by any sort of editorial commission, nor afterwards by way of sanction of what had been written. They were quite simply composed by pious people in honour of the saints, and without more ado, on account of their suitability and beauty, were received and swiftly and silently incorporated into the liturgical books of the Church, as also happened with the whole of the Church's rich hymnology of the seasons, from the most ancient times up till this day."[2]

It is difficult to escape the conclusion that in his desire to point the contrast between Roman Catholic and Orthodox practice, Professor Alivisatos has somewhat over-estimated the difference between them. On the one hand, popular acclamation still plays a large part in the Western process of recognition, and the Pope does not in fact claim to "make" saints, as the Greek word *Hagiopoiêsis* used to translate "canonization" suggests, but only to define who is worthy to be accorded public and official veneration. On the other hand, he seems to minimize the part which the hierarchy have played and do play in the Orthodox Church in regulating the devotion of the faithful. The reason why no official recognition was given to the cults of most of the new martyrs is simply, as the late Archbishop Chrysostom Papadopoulos pointed out, that during the Turkish domination it would have been impossible to do so.[3] However this may be, we must

[1] Ibid., p. 41.

[2] Ibid., p. 37, note 2.

[3] See Chrysostom Papadopoulos, *The Proclamation of Saints in the Orthodox Church*, 1934 (in Greek), pp. 11–12, where he says that certain of the new martyrs were officially recognized, and quotes the interesting case of St George of Jannina (d. 1839) who was proclaimed saint by the Oecumenical Patriarch after a commission of clergy and laity had inquired into the circumstances of his martyrdom; "the Church decided that his feast should be celebrated on January 17th, the same day as that of the holy Antony so that the Turks would not notice the feast of the new martyr George".

none the less accept Professor Alivisatos' main contention that in this matter the Eastern Church has rested more true to primitive tradition, both in the simplicity of its process of recognition and in the priority it gives to popular acclamation, to the "consensus fidelium". In this, as in all actions of the Church, whether in defining doctrine or celebrating the sacraments, it is the unanimity and co-operation of the whole body, clergy and laity, which is stressed rather than the initiative and authority of the hierarchy.

But the whole question need not be left in the realm of theory. In 1955, for the first time for many years the Oecumenical Patriarchate proclaimed a saint, Nicodemos Hagiorites, a spiritual writer of the late eighteenth century and compiler of the *Philokalia*. The short but dignified Synodical Act, in which this decision was announced, states that Nicodemos showed himself throughout his life to be "an example of life after Christ, and a living ikon of virtue, and by his various orthodox and spiritual writings, a teacher of the Church, and of the whole Christian people"; and it therefore decrees "that from now and henceforth to all ages Nicodemos Hagiorites shall be numbered among the holy and saintly men of the Church, being honoured with a yearly feast and revered with hymns of praise on July the fourteenth, on which day he departed blessedly to the Lord". In this case we have an example of a recognition in which the part played by the ecclesiastical authorities was very large. For though the action was requested by the monasteries of Mt Athos, where Nicodemos had been a monk, there was not any previous local cult of the saint nor any special popular acclamation. And this is not surprising when it is considered that his renown will always rest more on his numerous spiritual writings than on his life, about which not a great deal is known.

Quite different, and more in line with Professor Alivisatos' thesis, is the case of Nektarios Kephalas, Bishop of Pentapolis and founder of the Convent of the Holy Trinity on Aegina, who died as recently as 1920. Here we have a case of genuine popular acclamation, the more interesting in that Nektarios, who was a figure well known in the academic and ecclesiastical world of Athens, played a leading part in the central councils of the Greek Church. This is not the place to give an account of the life and work of this remarkable and many-sided man. He combined within himself the monk and the theological scholar, the preacher and the man of prayer. In the volume of tributes published in Athens in 1955,[1] some of the most distinguished professors of the Theological Faculty of Athens join with parish priests and abbots in witnessing to his sanctity and goodness. The cult is so far local, being celebrated in Aegina and in certain churches in Athens, but the tomb of the saint in the convent which he founded is already the centre of pilgrimage, and miracles are reported. In this case popular recognition and the composition of an office for the saint preceded by some years any official action. Since 1953, when the relics of the saint were solemnly translated in the presence of the

[1] *St Nektarios Kephalas* (in Greek), Athens, 1955.

Metropolitan of Aegina, the cult has had official authorization in that diocese. Meanwhile, the publication of the memorial volume will doubtless spread the reputation of the saint and prepare the way for wider recognition.

The relevance of all this to our Anglican situation would seem to be that we should regard the recognition of saints less as a matter for official decision than as one for popular initiative. To declare some of the departed "saints" in a particular sense of the word is not an act of the hierarchy alone, nor, and this is of great importance, does it create an exclusive and privileged class. It is an act of the whole Church acknowledging that to some of its members God in his inscrutable goodness has given special calls and a special generosity to respond to them. It is just because the whole people of God is "an holy people", because *all* Christians are "called saints", that the Church is able to recognize in some of its members an exceptional development of the life which is common to all. The saints, in the traditional sense of the word, are those who by God's grace have most fully become what all Christians by their faith and baptism are. They are those whom the Church declares to have been endued "with singular gifts of the Holy Ghost", whose "doctrine and holy life" we pray that we may follow and with whom we are "knit together in one communion and fellowship".[1]

If this belief in the communion of the saints departed with the Church on earth means anything, it is surely most unreal not to commemorate any names dating from more recent centuries than the fourteenth; unless, indeed, we suppose that the note of genuine sanctity has deserted the Church of England since the sixteenth century, in which case it seems difficult to maintain that our Church is truly part of the one holy Church. It is, in fact, the growing belief in the identity of the Church of England with the whole Church of which it is a part, and a growing sense of the reality of the communion of the saints, which have led to the present widespread discussion of this subject, and to the tentative moves which have been made towards the honouring of more recent English saints.[2] One of the purposes of this article has been to suggest that individuals, both clerical and lay, have up till now been unnecessarily inhibited in this matter, by the feeling that it was a question about which nothing could be done without an episcopal initiative. Whereas properly the

[1] In the words of the 1928 Prayer Book we are "encouraged by their examples and strengthened by their fellowship"; with the sanction of the Scottish Book of 1929 we could add "and aided by their prayers". The belief that the saints in heaven do pray for the Church on earth could be supported from at least some of the great Anglican theologians of the seventeenth century (compare W. Forbes, *L.A.C.T.*, Vol. II, pp. 228–30, and H. Thorndike, *L.A.C.T.*, Vol. IV, p. 763, and Vol. V, p. 248), not to mention a great many more recent writers. Those who share this belief will have additional reason to wish for a solution to our problem. But the issue remains important for those who prefer to reserve judgment on this particular point.

[2] As for instance in the annual pilgrimage of the Friends of Little Gidding, and the addition of an appendix of Anglican names to the calendar of the South African Prayer Book.

part of the hierarchy seems to be rather to regulate and authorize, or if necessary check, what has already been begun than itself to take the first steps. The recognition of Anglican saints, if it is to come, can come only through a deeper and more general understanding of the meaning of the communion of saints and of the nature of the Church.

There are, in conclusion, two objections which cannot remain unconsidered. First, there are many even within the Church who will complain that this whole subject is remote and unimportant. To this it must be said that for most lay people (and clergy too?) the belief that the Church of to-day, the local congregation to which we belong, is the same Church, with the same Lord and the same powers, as that of which we read in the New Testament and Church History, is a very difficult belief. And one most potent reason for this difficulty is the fact that "saints" for most people are creatures of the remote and distant past, not people who could inhabit England in the twentieth century. If, in an overworked phrase, the Church is to be the Church, this is a matter which demands our most serious attention. Secondly, and more fundamentally, there is the fear that in praising the saints we are giving to men the honours due to God alone. To this there is only one possible reply. By failing to honour and reverence the saints we are failing to acknowledge the greatness of what God has done in them. By ignoring those who have responded with singleness of purpose to the call of divine grace, and who have risen up in an exceptional degree to the life which they promised at their baptism, we show ourselves ungrateful to the God who called them and gave them to our unworthy and fragmented Church, and we amputate from ourselves the power of following their examples.

A. M. Allchin.

Commentaries on the Book of Isaiah

Part I (for general readers)

To translate the Book of Isaiah is to advance far in its exposition. This survey may well begin, therefore, by mentioning three works devoted primarily to a translation which is designed to convey the force of the original Hebrew. J. E. McFadyen's *Isaiah in Modern Speech* (J. Clarke, London, 1918) is notable for its rhythm and vigour; brief notes given in an appendix suggest the historical setting of the various prophecies and indicate how the translator has surmounted obstacles in the Hebrew text. More ambitious is the work of G. H. Box, *The Book of Isaiah, translated from a text revised in accordance with the results of recent criticism* (Pitman, London, 1908; corrected impression, 1916). Designed to assist English readers to make a searching study of Isaiah, this translation is printed in a variety of types as a guide to questions of authorship and is accompanied by brief introductions and footnotes in which much valuable

information is condensed. T. K. Cheyne, in *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah* (Polychrome Bible, J. Clarke, London, 1898), uses colour to distinguish between the prophetic authors and follows his translation with explanatory notes.

With the great awakening of interest in the prophetic books in the last century the prophets were now keenly studied as men of their times, and Isaiah in particular appeared as a fine public figure. Such a portrait is drawn by S. R. Driver in *Isaiah: His Life and Times* (Nisbet, London, 1888; 2nd ed., 1893), where Isaiah is described as statesman, reformer, theologian and poet. This little book is a good example of this great commentator's powers, and its scope is wider than the title suggests. In the course of a narrative of the eventful periods to which the prophecies relate, the whole book of Isaiah is expounded.

A similar method is followed by G. A. Smith in what has been considered the greatest work on Isaiah, *The Book of Isaiah* (Hodder and Stoughton, London; new and revised ed., 2 vols, 1927). This work first appeared in the Expositor's Bible in 1888–90, and has thus been a favourite for almost seventy years. The prophecies are expounded in their probable chronological order, but, while the historical setting is treated fully, the real subject of this work may be justly described in the author's words as "the message which God has sent to the world through the Book of Isaiah". The congregations of old Aberdeen were reputed not to expect brevity and haste from their preachers, and in these thousand eloquent pages we may savour some of the rich Sabbath fare to which they were accustomed.

Some prefer a commentary to have a certain formality of aspect, its pages duly bearing text above and comment beneath. Alas, how disproportionate these two elements are often revealed to be—so little text upheld by so much comment! In this respect, however, commentators on Isaiah's hard verses may be judged leniently. Mention may be made of three works of proved worth which use this form, printing the text of the Revised Version: O. C. Whitehouse, *Isaiah* (Century Bible, Jack, Edinburgh, 2 vols, 1905–8), J. Skinner, *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah* (Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, 2 vols, 1915–17), and G. W. Wade, *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah* (Westminster Commentaries, Methuen, London, 1911; 2nd ed., 1929). Of the three the single volume of Wade is probably the most convenient and the fullest in treatment.

So far no very recent commentaries have been mentioned, and in fact there are few available for the general reader. Rather more than half of the massive Volume 5 of the American *Interpreter's Bible* (Abingdon and Nelson, 1956; cf. THEOLOGY, July 1956, pp. 292 ff.) consists of Isaiah text and commentary. This work, designed especially to assist the preacher, prints the Authorized Version parallel with the Revised Standard Version at the head of each page, while the comment below is given in two divisions, critical and homiletic, contributed by different writers. It is a method which has disadvantages but may serve its special purpose. The critical notes are provided by R. B. Y. Scott (chs. i–xxxix) and J. Muilenburg (chs. xl–lxvi). The

homiletic exposition is by G. G. D. Kilpatrick (chs. i–xxxix) and H. S. Coffin (chs. xl–lxvi). W. E. Vine's *Isaiah* (Oliphant, London and Edinburgh, 1946) is a small commentary written from a fundamentalist point of view and seeking the application of the book, chapter by chapter, to the Christian life. Two new series, the Torch Bible and the Epworth Preachers' Commentaries, will eventually include works on the whole of Isaiah which should give the English reader the latest insights of research in simple form. So far, however, only C. R. North's *Isaiah* 40–55, *Introduction and Commentary*, has actually appeared. The author is a leading authority on these chapters and has given a useful guide in brief compass. The same chapters have also been expounded in another recent book of very different character, U. E. Simon's *A Theology of Salvation, A Commentary on Isaiah* 40–55 (S.P.C.K., London, 1953). The writer has examined his text, somewhat rigidly perhaps, from the point of view of "the Theology of the Word" and has given us a work surprisingly different both in form and content from the usual commentaries.

Much recent work regarding the Messianic prophecies and the Servant of the Lord in Isaiah is not easily accessible to English readers. In view of the interest of these subjects, this section may well conclude with a commendation of a small book which helps to meet this need, H. Ringgren's *The Messiah in the Old Testament* (S.C.M. Studies in Biblical Theology, London, 1956).

Part II (for students)

Of the old commentators on Isaiah three may well be mentioned: St Jerome, Ibn Ezra and Calvin. The Latin text of St Jerome's commentary is given in Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, volume 24, and is especially valuable for its preservation of early Rabbinical opinions. Ibn Ezra of Toledo was the most original of the medieval Jewish exegetes; his work has been edited with translation, notes and a valuable glossary by M. Friedländer (Trübner, London, 1877). Calvin's *Latin Commentary*, a work of characteristic thoroughness, has been translated by W. Pringle in rather more than 2,000 pages (for the Calvin Society, Edinburgh, 4 vols, 1850–3).

The modern period in the understanding of Isaiah may be said to begin with the famous commentary of the Oxford Professor of Poetry, R. Lowth, *Isaiah: a new translation with a preliminary dissertation and notes* (London, 1778). Here for the first time the poetical form of Isaiah was clearly displayed. Much of the textual discussion is still valuable, although T. K. Cheyne observed that Lowth had the appearance of holding a brief against the traditional text. Cheyne himself was a distinguished exegete of Isaiah. His two most important works are *The Prophecies of Isaiah, a new translation with commentary and appendices* (Kegan Paul, London, 2 vols, 1880; 5th ed., 1889) and *An Introduction to the Book of Isaiah, with an appendix containing the undoubted portions of the two chief prophetic authors in a translation* (Black, London, 1895). One of the few substantial English commentaries on Isaiah to have been completed in more

recent times is that of the Roman Catholic scholar E. J. Kissane, *The Book of Isaiah, Translation and Commentary* (Browne and Nolan, Dublin, 2 vols, 1941–3). This work is attractively set out and contains much valuable linguistic and exegetical discussion. The writer's attempt to establish the essential unity of the book is interesting if not in all respects convincing. I. W. Slotki's *Isaiah* (Soncino Bible, London, 1949) also treats the complete book, but on a much smaller scale. Here the Massoretic Hebrew text and the American Jewish Version are beautifully printed in parallel columns in short rhythmic lines, while a brief and simple commentary is given below. The book's usefulness to Christian readers lies in its pleasing arrangement of the text and translation and in the broad picture of Jewish interpretation which it offers.

A number of important works deal with only a part of Isaiah. Of these the greatest is that by G. B. Gray on chapters i–xxvii, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah* (International Critical Commentary, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1912), a book which is indispensable for serious study. Chapters xxxiv–xxxv and xl–lxvi are subjected to an unconventional examination by C. C. Torrey in *The Second Isaiah, A New Interpretation* (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1928), who argues that these chapters form a unity composed in their present order by a prophet living in Palestine about 400 B.C. This view, which has not won wide acceptance, is broadly stated in some introductory literary and critical essays which are followed by a translation of the text and detailed, often excellent, notes. R. Levy gives a useful commentary on chapters xl–lv in his *Deutero-Isaiah, a commentary together with a preliminary essay on Deutero-Isaiah's influence on Jewish thought* (Oxford University Press, 1925). The preliminary essay and the references to Jewish sources are contributions of special value and the linguistic discussions are helpful to students of the Hebrew text.

Several works may now be mentioned which, while not strictly commentaries, are notable attempts to deal with some of the fascinating questions raised by the latter part of the book. An interesting, if not always convincing, study, reinforced by a wealth of historical and bibliographical notes, is S. Smith's *Isaiah Chapters xl–lv: Literary Criticism and History* (Schweich Lectures, British Academy, 1944). P. A. H. de Boer has recently treated the same chapters in *Second Isaiah's Message* (Brill, Leiden, 1956). His philological notes are of interest, especially his comments on readings of the Dead Sea Scrolls, but the limits he sets to the import of the prophecies seem hard to justify. A good discussion of the complexities of these chapters with special reference to the Servant Songs is C. R. North's *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah, An Historical and Critical Study* (Oxford University Press, 1948; 2nd ed., 1956). The fact that the author gives a useful history of interpretation and a good bibliography may excuse lack of reference here to the multitude of treatises which have been written on special aspects of the latter part of Isaiah. Perhaps the most interesting of the studies referred to by Professor North are those of Elliger, Caspari and Begrich.

The most widely used French commentary has been that of A. Condamin, *Le Livre d'Isaïe, traduction critique avec notes et commentaires* (Paris, 1905). Excellent too is the much smaller, beautifully produced volume *Isaïe* by P. Auvray and J. Steinmann (Sainte Bible de Jerusalem, Editions du Cerf, Paris, 1951; 2nd ed., 1957). The authors divide their translation into headed sections, and their brief footnotes provide a commentary in two divisions, textual and exegetical. Steinmann's treatment of chapters i–xxxix in his *Le Prophète Isaïe; sa vie, son oeuvre et son temps* (Lectio Divina 5, Editions du Cerf, Paris, 1950; 2nd ed., 1955) is also admirable.

Of the numerous German commentaries the most influential has been that of B. Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaia übersetzt und erklärt* (Handkommentar zum Alten Testament, Göttingen, 1892; 4th ed., 1922). Good full-scale commentaries have also been provided by F. Feldmann (Münster, 2 vols, 1925–6) and E. König (Gütersloh, 1926). The series Kommentar zum Alten Testament (edited by E. Sellin, Leipzig) contains two excellent volumes on Isaiah, chapters i–xxxix by O. Procksch (1930) and chapters xl–lxvi by P. Volz (1932). This is probably the best commentary on Isaiah that has appeared in recent decades.

Only a selection of the labours to elucidate Isaiah has been mentioned above. Much has been done and still many questions remain unanswered. Above all, we still await an English commentator who will treat the composition of the entire book in the light of the new insights which have been gained into the relation between the great prophets and the societies of prophets. There is a tension between the undeniable unity of the book and the clear evidences of diversity of authorship which can only be resolved by taking the peculiar character of a prophetic society seriously into account. But even then, one may venture to predict, the Book of Isaiah will long continue to witness to the Bible's power to speak to the heart even while the head yet fails to encompass all its mysteries.

J. H. Eaton.

Letter from Nigeria

In November of this year the two dioceses of Eastern Nigeria (Niger and Niger Delta) celebrate the centenary of the coming of Bishop Crowther to Onitsha. The Church in Eastern Nigeria (following only a few years in the wake of the Church in the West) enters upon the second century of its life. And it is of "second-century Christianity" that one is constantly reminded by many features of the Church's life.

The second century was the period which saw the emergence of a clearly articulated structure of ministry and of church organization. Similarly, great progress has been made in Nigeria in the realm

of church organization in a comparatively short period. In 1951 the Province of West Africa was inaugurated as an autonomous province of the Anglican Communion. Six out of its total of nine dioceses are in Nigeria. Each of these has the usual complement of modern diocesan machinery, with its archdeaconries, synods, committees and the like. Virtually the whole of this organization is in Nigerian hands. Four out of the five diocesans in Southern Nigeria and all the clergy, apart from a few specialists, mostly in educational work, are Nigerians. All this represents a great measure of achievement, especially in view of the high value attached to self-government in the political field and the nearness of its realization. It has not, however, been without cost. The maintenance of such a considerable and essentially foreign pattern of organization is inclined to absorb too much of the church's energy and attention. But what other branch of the Anglican Communion is in a position to cast the first stone?

"Contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints." Such was the counsel of Jude, and it might not unfairly be described as the watchword of the sub-apostolic age. It would serve equally well as a description of the overriding aim of the leaders of the Church in Nigeria. The temper of the Church is essentially conservative; it looks back with well-merited respect and affection to the missionaries who first brought the gospel to Nigeria 100 years ago, and it conceives that faithfulness to that gospel and pietas to the memory of those missionaries must be expressed by continuing to act and believe in every detail as they did. In this respect the Church is completely out of touch with the temper of the country as a whole. In politics, in education and every other walk of life the emphasis lies upon the future; there is the thrill of rapid development and an excited confidence in the goal towards which the nation is pressing. By contrast the spirit of the Church looks to the past.

One minor and two major issues may serve to illustrate this. The normal clerical dress used in England is both inconvenient and incongruous in the tropics, yet quite deliberately no modifications have been adopted; this is a part of the Christianity that has been received and as such it ought to be retained.

The pattern of worship introduced by the first missionaries was the low church tradition of the late Victorian age. (If you ask a Protestant Christian in Nigeria to-day to what church or denomination he belongs, the answer you will get is Methodist, Presbyterian, Baptist or C.M.S.!) Nothing could be more ill-suited to the spontaneous vivacity and love of colour, which is so integral a part of the Nigerian character. Yet to this day the main act of worship in almost every Anglican church in Nigeria is an exact replica of Victorian Matins, translated into the appropriate language. (Unlike most services in England, it is in the versicles and responses that the service seems to come most alive. This may be a pointer to the kind of development that is needed.) The hymns that are sung are translations of European hymns set to European tunes, and as the languages of the area are tonal, the unnatural stresses of the European tunes often

render the words meaningless and unintelligible to the worshipper. A suggestion to allow a Westward celebration of the Holy Communion was opposed on the ground that celebration at the North End was the custom handed down by the first missionaries. A few ministers who have travelled overseas have brought back some new custom and introduced it here and there; but these are mostly unsystematic importations of isolated pieces of ritual. No radical attempt has yet been made to work out the truly Nigerian way of expressing the worship of the Catholic Church. A very small beginning has been made within the last year. There have been signs of interest both among church leaders and amongst some of the younger clergy in recent liturgical development in South India and in some of the other provinces of the Anglican Communion. It is beginning to be felt that some such development is needed in Nigeria, but the whole movement is still in its infancy.

A reunion movement is now well under way. The general apathy about it in the early stages was due not so much to awareness of theological difficulties, but rather to the fact that it was not an issue about which the early missionaries had been concerned, and therefore it was to be treated with reserve. A visit from October to December, 1955, by the Moderator of the Church of South India did much to stimulate interest. More recently the movement has begun to make rapid progress. A "Proposed Scheme of Church Union" for Nigeria and the Cameroons was published in April of this year. The Churches involved (in addition to the Anglican Church) are the Methodists and the Presbyterians (including the Basel Mission which operates in the Cameroons). There was considerable debate about the unification of the ministry—the Anglican Church favouring the method used in the Ceylon scheme and the Presbyterians that of South India. In the end it is the South India scheme that has been treated as the basic model, though no specific period of thirty years has been defined for the achievement of a fully episcopal ministry. Anglican support for a scheme of the Ceylon type seems to have been based more on advice from Canterbury than on strongly held convictions on the spot. There is not likely to be serious theological objection to the scheme from the Church in Nigeria itself. Probably the most important retarding factor from the Anglican point of view is the conflicting claims of the newly achieved Province of West Africa. If the Anglican Church in Nigeria were to leave the Anglican Communion to enter into a United Church of Nigeria, the Anglican Province of West Africa would drop from nine to three dioceses.

The second century was the age of the Gnostic sects—a vast variety of groups, some basically Christian in their thought and practice, others barely distinguishable from the surrounding paganism. These too have their counterparts in Nigeria to-day. In addition to many of the sects familiar in England, we find such groups as "The United Native African Church", "The African Church (Incorporated)", "Unity African Christ Church", "Christ Apostolic Church", "The Sacred Cherubim and Seraphim Society", "The Holy Flock of Christ" and countless others. They are as varied in character as the early

Gnostic sects. The majority of them in point of historical origin have broken away from the Anglican Church. The causes are numerous, but five principal issues deserve mention: (1) Personal quarrels and jealousies have often played their part, as in the origin of all schisms throughout Christian history. (2) Some groups have arisen as part of a desire to africanize the life of the Church. In some cases this has proved the beginning of the slippery slope to a syncretism which has only the faintest veneer of Christianity. Others have successfully adopted traditional African practices in a manner from which the orthodox Church could learn with profit. It is surprising to find, however, that some of the sects have remained entirely orthodox in doctrine and as loyal to the Prayer Book as the Anglican Church itself. (3) Another closely related cause has been dissatisfaction with the Church's strict rule against polygamy. Some of the groups allow polygamy to all their members, others to all except ministers (1 Tim. 3. 2 must be one of the most discussed verses of the Bible in Nigeria!). (4) Many of the groups have separated on the issue of faith-healing. Some go so far as to oppose the use of medicines altogether. This also is in part a protest against the Western culture, in which all orthodox Christianity is so inevitably involved. (5) Finally, literature from American fundamentalist sects have played a part in fomenting schism. These groups represent a significant feature of the religious life of Nigeria, of which serious note needs to be taken.[1]

Probably the most pressing problem of all before the Church at this moment is the future of the ministry. There are two theological colleges. One, Trinity College, Umuahia, has been a union college for many years (Anglican, Methodist and Presbyterian); the other, Melville Hall, Ibadan, will become a union college with the Methodists from January 1958. There are two great problems. The first is the numerical strength of the ministry. Many clergy are responsible for as many as thirty villages. This is no doubt a common experience in many of the younger churches, but that does not alter the seriousness of the problem. The kind of experiment being carried on in the Madurai Diocese of the Church of South India (described in the "Letter from South India", THEOLOGY, March 1957) ought to be followed here with great interest. No special measures are being undertaken to tackle this problem. The second problem is the very low educational standard of present candidates for the ministry. The majority are men over thirty, many of whom have spent some time as catechists and have then moved on to training for the ministry. There is a desperate need for men of a much higher educational standard in addition. Every attempt is being made to improve the educational equipment of those in training; but their ability is limited, and if they are pushed too hard intellectually, it can only be at the expense of their proper spiritual and pastoral training. The great need is for more ordinands from the rapidly growing number

[1] For further details of the sects, see G. Parrinder, *Religion in an African City* (Oxford, 1953), Ch. 5. B. Sundkler, *Bantu Prophets in South Africa* (London, 1948), is a fascinating, full-length account of similar phenomena in South Africa.

of boys with secondary education and potential university graduates. At the moment there is one ordinand among the 560 students of the University College at Ibadan. The difficulties are formidable. The financial difference between the salary of a minister and that open to a graduate in any other walk of life is immense. The problem is not merely one of readiness for personal sacrifice. The Nigerian has a very strong sense of the family, and the young graduate has a powerful moral obligation to use the higher level of income open to him to help other members of his family (and the word "family" has a much wider connotation than in England). Moreover, the standing of the ministry in the country as a whole is not high. But the problem is desperately urgent. The leaders of the new Nigeria in many walks of life are men of real ability and education. Unless there is a rapid change in the situation, in a few years time the Church will have practically no accredited ministers who can understand their problems or speak their language. Her chance of playing a significant part in the crucial years of the early development of the new nation is likely to go by default. The need is widely recognized, but it is not being tackled with the urgency that it deserves. The conservative temper of the Church and the respect for age, which is a characteristic of Nigerian society at large, all militate against a really radical approach to the problem.

All that has been said so far applies to Southern Nigeria. The position in the vast diocese of Northern Nigeria is entirely different. The whole organization and culture over a great part of the country is Islamic. The work of the Church has been severely restricted by the British government. Its work is still in the pioneer stage, and there is as yet little fruit to show for much devoted labour. There are few Hausa Christians, and no Hausa has yet been ordained to the ministry. The great majority of Christians in the North are Southerners resident there, who in respect of their religion at least are as much foreigners as Europeans. Nor do they show any inclination to evangelize amongst the indigenous peoples of the North. Islam, on the other hand, is not so confined to the North. In Western Nigeria paganism is out of fashion. The effective choice now lies between Islam and Christianity. In many ways Islam makes less exacting demands and has done more to adapt itself to Nigerian customs than Christianity. As a result it is spreading rapidly in the Western Region. In the past the Church outside the North has taken little cognizance of Islam. But now there is evidence of a new awareness of its significance, and a desire for more serious study of its teaching and of appropriate methods of evangelism in face of it.

One thing remains to be said. It can be said briefly, but it is perhaps of as much significance as all that has gone before. By and large the churches of Nigeria are full. And there are to be found in them a greater proportion of men than is commonly seen in England. No doubt this church loyalty is often combined with a very imperfect understanding of the faith and sometimes a far from orthodox morality. But it is not therefore hypocrisy. It is rather the expression of a real and genuine piety. And this is true not only in the villages.

If there is but one ordinand amongst 560 undergraduates, there are 300 S.C.M. members, most of whom are to be found in the College Chapel Sunday by Sunday.

MAURICE WILES.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. Sydney Evans is Dean of King's College, London.

The Rev. A. M. Allchin is Curate of St Mary Abbots, Kensington. He studied in Greece 1955–6.

Mr Eaton is Assistant Lecturer in Theology in the University of Birmingham.

The Rev. Maurice Wiles is Lecturer in New Testament Studies at University College, Ibadan.

CORRESPONDENCE

DIVORCE

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

One can quarrel with many of the statements and assumptions of Lady Oppenheimer's interesting and able article on divorce. How certain can we be of the authenticity of two texts—or of the unauthenticity of part of one of them? How compatible (or incompatible) are Christ's alleged strictures against divorce and re-marriage with his extraordinary power of penetrating, in love and understanding, into individual cases? How compatible are they with the whole spirit of his teaching? Are spontaneous answers to particular questioners to be interpreted as laying down an absolute rule for all persons for ever? Even supposing they were so intended, are we to assume that the human Jesus was always infallibly right? Is it sound to consider the remarks on divorce, grouped with the "Sermon on the Mount", as *particular* rules of action (never to use force, go to law . . . divorce . . .) rather than as prophetic paradoxes expressing principles whose true acceptance completely transforms life but never offers an exact universal code in advance? If the answer given to this is "No", can the objector be fairly and unquestionably accused of disloyalty to all Christian principle?

But what strikes me as so extraordinary is that Lady Oppenheimer should imagine that in rejecting "Rigorism" she has escaped legalism. For legalism it is. Because, and only because, of the alleged "rule", it is always, she assumes, Christianally *wrong* to divorce and remarry, and there must be "repentance" if it is done. How can this possibly be compatible with her own admission (p. 317) that it is by the spirit in which we act that we shall be judged. We are not "simply to keep a law but to try to see what in our own circumstances is the course most in accordance with the spirit of Christian love". Neither Lady

Oppenheimer nor anyone else has any right to say that, difficult as it may be, and tragic and terrible in suffering, divorce and remarriage may not be sought and accomplished humbly, in constant prayer, in the spirit of Christian love—a course for which it would be a lie in the soul to pretend "repentance". No one has a *human* right to say it at all. And there is no *logical* right to say that "remarriage is a betrayal of the Christian spirit" unless the criterion of the "Christian" spirit in this case is solely a legalistic one.

If Christianity is really this legalism, and the Church stands for it, there are many, with all their hearts and minds believing in *Caritas*, who must sadly turn their backs on this "Christian" Church, as this Church must repudiate them because they will not, cannot (and *should* not) "repent" of what in their integrity they believe right.

Yours faithfully,

L. Arnaud Reid.

50 Rotherwick Road,
London, N.W.11.
22 *August* 1957.

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

"We have law, as Christ expressly told us, for our hardness of heart." Lady Oppenheimer, in your August number, leads us to conclude from this that it is bad to be dutiful. In fact, she makes the very questionable claim that "when one begins to ask legal questions about moral problems one has already stepped outside Christianity" (p. 316).

By a "legal question" she means one in the style, "In what circumstances may I divorce my wife?" though she also implies that those questions and answers are unchristian which ask or decide what is "fair" and what can be required of us. I should have thought that "Thou knowest the commandments, Do not commit adultery" was a legal answer to a moral question. And it is at least arguable that the 1956 Royal Commission on Marriage and Divorce was giving a Christian as well as a legal answer to a moral problem when it would not allow a divorce decree to become absolute until the court was satisfied that the best feasible arrangements had been made for the children.

If the Churches in Nigeria came to ask Lady Oppenheimer what they should do about all their polygamous catechumens, would she say, "There are no *rules*; just tell them to be perfect"? Or if a bishop in the Lords, or a Christian M.P., came to inform her that there was a lot of dispute about what should be the law of the land in regard to marriage and divorce, would she say, "The Church cannot and ought not to answer questions about good and bad laws"? Lady Oppenheimer does not envisage any circumstances in which it is

proper for a Christian to recover goods that have been stolen from him: "If a man asks, 'May I as a Christian claim damages in a law court for a wrong done to me?' the answer is, 'You cannot say you are doing it as a Christian'" (p. 317).

Lady Oppenheimer's article indicates that she does not understand what legislators who are Christians think they are doing. Whether they are canonists or M.P.s or moral theologians or just parents demanding obedience, they are not teaching counsels of perfection. They are trying to decide what is not allowable.

We may agree with her that "the root of the problem is a misconception of the nature of law in its relation to Christian morality" (p. 315). But that is a long way from saying that Christians do not need rules at all, except to begin with (p. 316).

It is very exasperating to be told that the problems of moral life can be solved only by ignoring the ordinary rules of moral life.

Yours faithfully,
E. O. Jones.

Church House,
Chapel Gate,
Retford.

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

Lady Oppenheimer's article on "Divorce and Christian Teaching" seems to dismiss too easily what she calls "the two standards view", i.e. that there should be two explicit kinds of marriage: secular, which can be dissolved by a legal process; and Christian, which is declared from the outset to be indissoluble. She does so on two grounds and for an additional reason. The grounds are (1) that indissolubility is right and God's will for every marriage, not just Christian marriages; (2) that from the pastoral point of view "people on the fringes of the Church would be driven out and a fine opportunity for evangelizing would be lost". The additional reason is that this view seems to be the "least influential and can be discussed briefly". This last reason appears to include a *non sequitur*, to put it mildly.

The first ground derives its validity from the fact that the word "marriage" is used in two different senses. First of all it is used in a Christian sense, which applies, as the Bishop of Exeter says, no less to non-Christian unions than to Christian ones. Secondly, it is used, as the State has decided to use it, as the name for a more or less permanent contractual union. As long as we continue to mix up the two we shall see no light in this problem. (Here it is worth reminding the upholders of Lady Oppenheimer's "pastoral" view that although Christ never legislated he did define, and the question that must tax the conscience of those faced with this problem is, "How can I call a union 'marriage' which my Lord called adultery?")

The second ground is that to divide the two forms of marriage would be to do great pastoral harm. This surely is putting the cart before the horse. Too much harm has already been done to the Church by those who would water down the Faith to make it easier.

I remain, sir,

Your obedient servant,

TIMOTHY BEAUMONT.

CATHEDRAL LODGE,
GARDEN ROAD,
HONG KONG.

THE PRESBYTERA

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Clergy wives start off with two advantages. Our husbands go on loving us, not because we are nice, but because it would be wrong for them not to. This is very consoling, but does not of course absolve us from our duty to be as loving and amiable as possible. Then the very fact that we never really come first with our husbands helps to humility and gives a detachment in our security which makes the mystery of marriage more tolerable.

I think that John's wife is trying to do too much. After all, we solemnly promised to cherish our husbands, not to run their parishes for them. It is our job to make them comfortable and serene at home, so that they can do their job well. Ideally, clergy wives should not have to teach in the Sunday school nor be enrolling members for the Mothers' Union. If we go to the Women's Institute, it is to meet our friends and to learn how to make easy supper dishes, and we are justified in looking the other way when they want volunteers for jumble sales or making new curtains for the village hall.

I agree that we must somehow keep up our reading, but let us be selective, according to our present state of life. I always find St Francis de Sales helpful—his "doucement" is as applicable to us as to seventeenth-century ladies of leisure—and Père de Caussade. And I go back again and again to St Thérèse of Lisieux and the little way and true justification by faith.

Surely the P.C.C. ought to have done something about the film projector and the refrigerator?

Yours faithfully,

MARGARET E. HILL.

PAPWORTH EVERARD RECTORY,
CAMBRIDGE.
11 *September* 1957.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

It is with considerable diffidence that I venture to cross swords with a fellow parson's wife of far greater experience and ability than

myself, but her article "The Presbytera" so perturbed me that I feel impelled to make some comment.

In the first place, I wish I could feel convinced that there is a specific vocation, as such, to be a parson's wife, trained and qualified for a definite pastoral work in the parish. Surely it is the *priest* who is trained—and empowered— to fill this role, and the vocation of his wife is nothing more or less than the fulfilment of the three causes of matrimony as set out in the marriage service. She will, of course, enter lovingly and sympathetically into his work, as would any true wife, but she is nowhere required to do his work with him, but only to enable him to do it himself to the best of his ability. The emphasis, therefore, which "John's wife" lays on theology, teaching experience, musical ability, etc., is to my mind exaggerated and false. It suggests that clerical marriages are in fact the establishment of a joint partnership of two qualified and practising doctors: if that were so, clergy would rarely marry anyone but deaconesses. Of course the parson's wife meets everyday questions fraught with theological problems—but who doesn't? And isn't what is required of her precisely that required of every Christian layman, namely to instruct himself in his religion sufficiently "to be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you"? She is not here in a unique position—indeed, the members of the non-clerical household frequently have a far sharper encounter with personal problems in the outside world from people who would never dream of mentioning such things to a parson's wife, precisely because she *is* a parson's wife.

It is, moreover, often a serious hindrance if the parson's wife is both willing and able to turn her hand to Sunday school teaching, youth clubs, playing the organ, etc., since modest parishioners hesitate to offer their own services, whilst others shelter conveniently behind the vicar's all-obliging spouse. I myself was so hopelessly incompetent at instructing the young that I begged to be dismissed, since when a steady stream of really gifted people has undertaken this very important work incomparably better than I could ever have done; and never was I more glad than when the arrival of our first child freed me—and the congregation—of the agony of playing the organ on Sundays, and forced the Church Council both to find—and to pay—a qualified person to take my place. Trivial though these examples may be, they are indicative of the paralysis that can affect a parish when one person in it is well trained in too many spheres of activity.

The financial hardships of parsonage households need little comment, but I was deeply shocked that the money saved up by John and his wife for a refrigerator was allowed to be diverted to the purchase of a film strip projector. The money for the latter should surely have come from the parish who, according to your writer, considered a refrigerator to be a *sine qua non* and therefore presumably already possessed this boon themselves. I hope also that I am not being self-righteous when I deplore the sentiments of the older clergyman's wife who would never have gone through with it if she had known in

advance how her husband would neglect her and her comfort. It seems such a sad commentary on that marriage, and the word "neglect" suggests a lack of caring which is by no means a true description of all clerical marriages.

I suppose that the question of hospitality differs to a large extent with the social conditions of each parish, and I would like to add a comment on this. In our own parish, which is mainly industrial and working class, hospitality does not extend beyond the proverbial "cuppa"—anything more would be an embarrassment. Moreover, the smaller the parsonage house, and the more it is like their own, the smaller is any lingering sense of class barrier and of inferiority. Shortage of space prevents my expanding on this, and I can only hint at these ideas.

Finally, I simply cannot endorse the statement about never making a great personal friend in the parish. No wonder John's wife is so lonely! Surely to goodness, parsons' wives are human—and expected to be human by their people—and no life without special friends *is* fully human. Even our Lord had Peter, James, John, Lazarus, Martha and Mary. It is no answer to say that one's special friends must be those *outside* the parish, for they may live miles away and rarely be seen from year to year. To have one or more intimate friends is not, *ipso facto*, to debar everyone else from one's friendship; indeed, if one is going to erect a fence round one's heart for fear of offending anyone, then one is never going to progress far with any relationship anywhere.

Which brings me to my conclusion, namely, that the parson's wife is first and foremost a wife, and (one hopes) a mother; that her home should be an example of the best that Christian marriage can build; that she is required by God, by her husband, her children, and her fellow parishioners to be a person and *not* a persona, and that the essential qualifications for all these are not primarily an academic training (which could hinder as much as it could help) but those gifts of grace commonly needed by all wives and mothers—great love, great patience and great humour. If we take ourselves *too* seriously, we really are lost.

Yours faithfully,
ANN STOKES.

4 WINDMILL ROAD,
ADEYFIELD,
HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HERTS.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I was interested to read Mr J. I. Miller's suggestion about training the fiancées of ordinands. If I may say so, an even better source of help than the Mothers' Union would be the Secretary of the Board of Women's Work in whatever diocese the fiancée lived. This secretary could put her in touch with the nearest training college where she could take a special course, or would direct her

studies and practical work in a local group if a residential short course were not possible.

Yours faithfully,
M. Tite, *Deaconess.*

49 Queensland Avenue,
London, N.18.

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

The interesting article on "The Presbytera" begins with a question, "Can there be such a thing as a vocation for the priest's wife capable of being recognized and answered as there can be for the priest himself, or for a doctor, or for a nurse?" Might I suggest that the significant question is rather, "Can there be such a thing as a vocation for the priest's wife which is fundamentally different from the vocation to be the wife of a Christian layman?"

Many of the differences between the wives of clergy and of Christian laymen seem to me to be of degree rather than of essence. There are many families which are trying to manage on a comparatively small income because the husband has chosen to be a school teacher or a youth club leader or to work for a voluntary society. There are the less spectacular but perhaps the hardest where the husband has chosen to give less time to getting on in his profession so that he can also devote himself to unpaid works of charity. Lay households are expected to be given to hospitality and find that they are usually busy helping and cherishing those who come their way rather than entertaining friends of their choice.

I have heard it argued by lay wives that clergy households are in some ways luckier than theirs, as the priest is at home for some part of every day, while a layman often leaves his home in the early morning and goes straight on in the evening to some meeting or parochial activity. There could be, perhaps, a satisfaction in the unity of work within a parish denied to a layman who has to balance the claims of profession or job, parish, deanery, diocese and such activities as politics and trades unions which demand allegiance from the layman who is trying to live out his faith as fully as possible.

I have never lived in a vicarage, though I have received great kindness from many, but I hope it is not presumptuous of me to wonder if the Clergy Wives Anonymous suggested in the article could not be supplemented by some learning together of the vocation to being Christian wives, so that clergy wives and lay wives could come to understand their fundamental unity of vocation and to appreciate each other's joys and difficulties in working it out in their different settings.

Yours faithfully,
Olive Parker.

225 Archway Road,
London, N.6.

CHRISTIAN GIVING

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

It is quite possible for "Modern Tithing", as described by Mr Rice in your September number, to operate in England as well as America; and I would say that here, too, we can best tackle Christian giving from the inside. A Direct Giving Campaign, run in the Bishop of Michigan's words with "gratitude to God and not the inadequate budget" as the motive of giving, can become a powerful handle of mission and, incidentally, transform the annual income of a church. This parish ran a Direct Giving (or "Modern Tithing") Campaign earlier in the year with John 3. 16 as the running theme. Many people found that they were faced afresh with the question, "What think ye of Christ?" In hard cash the campaign has meant that a weekly income which a year ago was under £6 has now become one of over £60. If Christian giving is to become the naturally accepted responsibility of the people of the Church, there is need, as Mr Rice emphasized, for continued teaching about it.

One further point of agreement with the author of the article—All Souls', Ancoats, is not patronized by millionaires; it is in the English scene like the church Mr Rice referred to in the American, a workers' church in an industrial area.

Yours faithfully,
J. B. R. GRINDROD.

ALL SOULS' RECTORY,
ANCOATS,
MANCHESTER 4.

BOOK REVIEWS

WILLIAM WAKE, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY, 1657–1737. By Norman Sykes. Cambridge University Press. 2 vols. 84s.

Dr Norman Sykes's Life of Archbishop Wake is a contribution of the first importance to the history of the Church of England. It is also extremely interesting, besides being written in admirable English prose, and contains material of great value for the present day, notably in the field of Christian reunion. The author set out on what he describes as "an apparently timeless task" nearly thirty years ago. His starting point was the collection of Wake Manuscripts in the Library of Christ Church, Oxford, the sheer scale of which had deterred previous students from attempting anything like a proper biography. In addition to these thirty-one volumes, and a supply of foreign correspondence discovered in Switzerland, Dr Sykes had the good fortune to be given access to a previously unknown autobiography dealing with the first forty-eight years of Wake's life, i.e.

up to the time of his appointment as Bishop of Lincoln. There can be no question that alike by the structure of the two volumes, by his careful exposition and analysis, and the fullness and aptness of the quotations, Professor Sykes has rendered excellent service both to students of history and to churchmen in general.

Wake described himself as "a lover of quiet above all things". He talked of retiring to a life of contemplation as early as 1680, when installed as a Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. He also greatly disliked any kind of "scuffle" with his friends and was a man of delicate conscience. But the age in which he lived was eventful beyond the ordinary, and once he had accepted the office of a bishop, after refusing two earlier nominations, he had his full share of the troubles and trials in which the Church and the State were involved. His interests were various. But chief amongst them was the unity of the Church. Dr Sykes describes and illustrates the different stages of Church relations both with the Roman Catholic Church and with the Protestant Churches on the Continent. Wake's first active intervention was at Paris, whither he went in 1682 as chaplain to Viscount Preston, Envoy Extraordinary to the Court of St James. Here he found "the papists" very busy with his sick parishioners, learnt a good deal about the Roman Catholic Church, and—most remarkable of all—entered on a theological controversy with the great Bossuet, in which he gained no small success. Moreover, it is notable, as Dr Sykes points out, that in his *Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England,* written in reply to Bossuet, 1686, he maintained substantially the same position as he took, when Archbishop of Canterbury, in his argument with M. du Pin and M. Girardin thirty years later. The author's survey of the latter correspondence and the part played by Cardinal de Noailles, Archbishop of Paris, is of absorbing interest. It reveals both Wake's strong desire for a *rapprochement* with Rome, and his appreciation of the limits beyond which the Church of England could not go. Incidentally, the similarities between the Wake–du Pin correspondence and the Malines Conversations over two hundred years later during Randall Davidson's primacy are happily indicated.

Wake was no less zealous in his work for union between the Church of England and the Protestant Churches on the Continent. And, since the principles which Wake applied in Church relations with Roman Catholics were in the main the same as those applied in relations with the Protestant Churches, the full exposition which the biography contains has a special value for all concerned with the urgent problem of Church relations to-day and with the ecumenical movement generally. "The peace of Christendom", he wrote to Professor Turrettini in Geneva on 29 October 1719, "can no way be restored but by separating the *fundamental articles* of our religion (in which almost all Churches do agree) from others, which in their several natures, though not strictly fundamental, may be of more, or less, moment to us in the way of our salvation" (I, 253). He is emphatic as to the necessary restoration of episcopacy amongst the Reformed Churches of the Continent as a condition of corporate union. At the same time, like Hooker and Bishop Andrewes, he refused to un-

church other Churches for the want of episcopacy. Writing to Père Le Courayer on 9 July 1724 he says:

> I bless God that I was born and have been bred in an episcopal Church, which I am convinced has been the Government established in the Christian Church from the very time of the apostles. But I should be unwilling to affirm that where the ministry is not episcopal, there is no church nor any true administration of the sacraments (II, 14).

The chapters on Withstanding Peter to the Face, The Gallican Correspondence, and The Union of Protestants, are full of illuminating extracts from Wake's writings and correspondence, and of remarkable interest. There is also a chapter on a kindred theme, The Validity of Anglican Orders, in which Dr Sykes comments on Wake's reply to Père Le Quien on the subject of the Nag's Head fable:

> Not even Dr Claude Jenkins was to deal more intriguingly with Mgr A. S. Barnes than did Wake with his Dominican adversary (I, 339).

There are many other issues treated in the two volumes, always instructively, often entertainingly as well—Convocation, Bishop Hoadley and Modernism, the things that are Caesar's, the office and work of a bishop, Wake's relations with the State, with his colleagues, and notably with Bishop Edmund Gibson. Wake did not indeed achieve the great place among the Archbishops of Canterbury which might have been expected. But his "massive and many-sided" contribution to the good estate of the Ecclesia Anglicana can now be infinitely better understood than ever before, thanks to this most just and comprehensive biography. Indeed, it is not too much to say that Dr Sykes's Life of William Wake is one of those books which no student of the spirit, and practice, of the Church of England can afford to neglect.

George Cicestr:

Chichester.

Puritanism in the Period of the Great Persecution, 1660–88. By G. R. Cragg. Cambridge University Press. 30s.

Provided its readers recognize that this essay is only half the story of one-quarter of one century it should do no great harm. Historians of those unhappy decades do not, we know, write with an eye on the ecumenical movement of to-day. Still, the fact remains that if, in search of a theme, they elect to isolate the sufferings inflicted on one side by the other, they are unlikely to further the contemporary Anglican efforts to persuade Nonconformists to take episcopacy into their systems. No small labour of research and compilation lies behind Dr Cragg's volume, but the greater the industry the more conclusive will the evidence appear to the uninformed reader, while the professional with some knowledge of what came before and after will probably rate the work lower than it deserves. The isolation of a very heterogeneous group and the strict limitation of period precludes that linking of cause and effect which is one of the duties and pleasures of the historian's craft; however much the author appears

to eschew partisan bias he cannot do justice to either persecuted or persecutors. Dr Cragg is not, we imagine, responsible for the inaccurate, tendencious and exasperating "blurb" which sets the scene as a conflict of light and darkness, of Christian against Apollyon, in which meek and inoffensive and liberty-loving Nonconformists were harried, gaoled and done to death by the coarse emissaries of a cruel, wicked and worldly Establishment. When sister Sarah told old Isaac D'Israeli that young Benjamin had written a novel entitled *The Young Duke*, the old man asked, "*The Young Duke*? But what does Ben know about dukes?" So may an historian in Montreal unconsciously substitute a mass of information for real understanding of an age and a social landscape more remote from him than were dukes to young Benjamin. For even if we dismiss the inaccuracies of the dust-cover as pure bait we should be compelled to join issue with the very title; we should wish to ask: What was this "Puritanism" and when was this "Great Persecution"? Though the first dubiety is briefly mentioned in the preface there is no sustained usage of the vital distinction between Presbyterian and Independent and of both from Quakers, Anabaptists and the numerous antinomian sects whose one bond was their repudiation of any national ecclesiastical organization. At the Restoration there were at least four categories of "Puritans" and there were plenty of Puritans of one sort persecuting those of another; there were, for instance, Baptists who memoralized Charles II (of all possible deliverers) complaining that they found the yoke of the new presbyter heavier than that of the old priest; Presbyterians, for their part, were prepared to tolerate bishops before Baptists.

Secondly, persecution itself was no novelty—there was some, we believe, between 1642 and 1660—and the post-Restoration outbreak was neither as consistent or severe as during the Interregnum. The more moderate and amenable Presbyterians and Independents do not seem to have fared so badly. Some had their wives with them, and Baxter himself compared his first imprisonment with taking lodgings in London for six months. Heywood had his wife, his Greek Testament and his pipe. Visitors were almost too many. Some prisoners were allowed to go home by day and knew where the gaoler kept the key. That there were brutality, wretchedness and suffering no one need deny, but it should be remembered that rough justice and draconian severity were the rule of that age and for long after. Did not John Howard declare that the English prisons were the worst in Europe? An unpaid and untrained magistracy, sometimes worried and irritated beyond endurance, were served by rough and ignorant underlings accustomed to the charge not of a Baxter or a Bunyan but of robbers, thieves and cut-throats. None of these nor the infamous breed of informers were, we trust, meant to be taken as types of a "resurgent Anglicanism". And by 1672 the Puritans were beginning to put themselves under the protection of the new Whig magnates, to erect meeting houses and to ordain ministers; Bunyan was out of jail and minister of Bedford Meeting with so much freedom for pastoral visitation that some were talking of him as Bishop

Bunyan. Fox's earlier hardships did not prevent his reaching his three score years and ten, nor Baxter's from reaching seventy-five.

As to the responsibility of the clerical order, it is well known that some prelates (Sheldon himself, Brownrigg of Exeter and Kidder of Bath and Wells, among others) did much to ease matters for dissenters and later to induce them to accept ordination, while the humbler parish clergy now returning to their livings could not, of course, have prevented the penal laws from taking their course—laws made, however, not by them nor by Convocation (which was suspended 1664–89), but by royalist Parliament men smarting from the remembrance of wrongs endured and really convinced that nonconforming Puritanism was as dangerous to the State and the monarchy as to the Church and the religion of their fathers. The parish clergy had not yet advanced to that social equality with the lesser squirearchy which later produced the parson-magistrate. Eachard's *Contempt of the Clergy and Religion* (1670), unnoticed in Dr Cragg's over-elaborate bibliography, provides ample evidence of the low estate of the clerical order at the time. And then, as now, the rulers of this world pay little heed to the opinions and persuasions of the poor and the lowly. George Saintsbury speaks of the "hard, practical, businesslike mood" of the years under survey. The Tory Cavaliers were out to put down sedition, as Jeffreys told Baxter in the dock. And that was that. We may suggest that prelates and clerics, parochial or academic, were far less responsible for the persecution of the Puritans than they were unhappily for the rabbling of the Methodist and Moravian missionaries a century later. Be that as it may, we do beg Dr Cragg to believe that Judge Jeffreys was not a typical specimen of "resurgent Anglicanism", nor Butler's *Hudibras* (1662–78) a true reflection of the mind and spirit of the best and most representative churchmen.

W. G. Addison.

Britford, Wilts.

Thomas Haweis, 1734–1820. By Arthur Skevington Wood. S.P.C.K., for the Church Historical Society. 50s.

Thomas Haweis was the composer of the hymn-tune "Richmond", and that is all that most churchpeople know about him. Dr Skevington Wood's book is a successful attempt to rescue from undeserved oblivion a clergyman of great versatility, who during his long life exercised considerable influence within the Evangelical Revival and the modern missionary movement that arose from it. Although it is with these two aspects of his work that Dr Wood is chiefly concerned, he has in fact written a full and interesting biography of Haweis, making good use of valuable primary sources which include an unpublished autobiography, a diary, a memorandum entitled "The Origin of the Missionary Society", and numerous letters and pamphlets. The book is well written apart from occasional lapses into pious journalese and pulpit jargon. Haweis' versatility is well demon-

strated by the wide range of his own literary output. He not only produced his own hymn book, consisting of 256 of his own hymns, for 56 of which he had composed the tunes as well, but he also wrote a two-volume Bible commentary, a three-volume Church history, and a life of William Romaine. The main landmarks of his life were: his conversion under Samuel Walker of Truro in 1754; his stormy curacy at St Mary Magdalene, Oxford (1757–62), during which time he became a powerful centre of Evangelical influence in the university; his appointment to the Rectory of Aldwincle, Northamptonshire, in 1764; his becoming a chaplain to the Countess of Huntingdon ten years later and his subsequent appointment in 1790 to be a trustee of her Connexion; the formation of the London Missionary Society in 1795, of which he must be considered one of the three founders; and his three marriages, 1771, 1788 and 1802.

Dr Wood is at pains to place "Haweis the Evangelical" (p. 4). He is surely right in seeing the Evangelical Revival as a wide movement, of which the Wesleys' revival was a tributary, not the source; the other main tributary being Anglican Evangelicalism. He is also justified in following Canon Smyth and Professor G. C. B. Davies in asserting that the real question of difference between the two was Church order—Wesley and Walker representing the two extremes. Dr Wood correctly points out that many Anglican Evangelicals were not as rigid as Walker and indulged in itinerancy, but he fails to show that the leaders of the next generation—Henry Venn and John Newton—were prepared to accept and practise irregularity only as an expedient for a limited period; they were not prepared to allow either themselves or their followers to be pushed out into dissent; they valued what they called "the Church principle" too highly. That is why the main body of Anglican Evangelicals could not throw their lot in with the London Missionary Society, but had to form the Church Missionary Society. Haweis, although a protégé of Walker's, took a different line from about the time of his appointment as a trustee of the Countess of Huntingdon's Connexion in 1790. Previous to this he had done everything to keep himself within the lawful bounds of the Church of England and also to dissuade the Countess from turning her Connexion into a distinct and centrally organized denomination. From 1790 he was responsible for supplying the Connexion's pulpits with preachers and at the same time he was devoting himself to the founding of the London Missionary Society "without respect to different denominations of Christians". At the first valedictory meeting for departing missionaries Haweis was the celebrant. For none of this activity, which spread beyond the borders of the Church to which he was ordained, did Haweis seek episcopal sanction, yet he was left undisturbed as the occasionally resident rector of Aldwincle till his retirement in 1809. In days of stricter discipline this would have been impossible, but in the time before Bishop Blomfield and the Ecclesiastical Commission, a minister like Rowland Hill or Thomas Haweis, who had fallen foul of both university authorities and the bishops, was able to exercise a semi-Anglican ministry. In Haweis' case the luxury of his anomalous position was made

financially possible by at least two of his marriages (which, incidentally, also enabled him to be extremely generous to L.M.S.).

Dr Wood fails to take sufficient account of the dislike Haweis brought upon himself both by his social climbing and by his ecclesiastical irregularity. In 1777 Henry Venn wrote to his son from Bath, "Mr Haweis has done much harm here. He and his lady dress extravagantly and live in all the pride of life, which is so contrary to the spirit of a Christian minister", and John Venn himself has this stinging comment on a short life of Henry Venn Haweis had published, the aim of which, Venn said, was "to represent him as a High Calvinist and a patron of that irregularity and disorder for which Dr Haweis may wish to plead as many examples as he can for his own justification". These are harsh words; perhaps Venn would withdraw them if he were alive to-day to see the London Missionary Society successfully following the interdenominational line Haweis had laid down for it alongside the Church Missionary Society following the Church principle he had himself set before it in 1799.

Michael Hennell.

St Aidan's College,
Birkenhead.

The Idea of Revelation in Recent Thought. By John Baillie. Oxford University Press. 15s.

This book consists of a course of lectures given in Aberystwyth and later in the United States in 1952 and 1954 respectively. It is a clearly written survey of writing up to that time on the subject of revelation, its mode and content, and its reception by us. Dr Baillie sets out with an historical outline which reveals the strange confusion of mind amongst the Reformers about the status of natural reason; Luther indulging in his famous diatribes against the decadent scholastic tradition he had known; and Calvin beginning the process of a new scholasticism which merged into rationalist Deism in a later century. He brings out the significance of Kant's reaction to what *he* called rationalism; but makes it clear that in his violent distinction between the spheres of faith and of pure reason Kant was himself something of a rationalist of the very type he was criticizing (just as Descartes was in some respects a medieval thinker rather than a modern), in the sense that for both of them their prime intellectual problems only arose because they were disturbed by presuppositions which they regarded as more deeply rooted in the nature of things than we now know them to be. Some of the questions they raised were metaphysical anxieties to be purged by logical therapy rather than true problems. Schleiermacher, who conceived the heart of religion to consist in a sense of dependence on God, was nearer the truth than he knew and has much in common with some aspects of Newman's thought; though his curious repudiation of this sense as in any way cognitive, but more closely allied to feeling, is just an example of the confusions we get into about words. Is not this distinction (and we

should remember that a great deal stemmed from it) a simple confusion which arises from too narrow a definition of what is meant by "cognitive" at the outset? For what meaning can we give to "feeling" which is not in some way *known*? Always men have been prone to make distinctions between their certainties about practical matters and the deeper certainties of religious apprehension. "I trust X. Why do you trust him? I do not *know*. But I *feel* I can." In the case of Hegel, consciousness had no other task but to grasp the truths presented to it in the form of images, which it is the function of philosophy to transmute into concepts—a curiously perverted notion which provoked the nineteenth century solution of the problem, which assumed that Hegelian philosophy was the rational truth of which the Christian religion was the symbolic form; and thus, religion and philosophy being one, there could be no real notion of revelation. Traditional theology, on the other hand, still clung to the notion of revelation as the communication of truths in the form of propositions. Or so we are constantly told.

It is against this unpromising background that the modern revival has taken place. Kittel is quoted to represent the biblical theologians' contribution to the discussion, that revelation is never communication of knowledge, nor stimulus to numinous feelings, but rather the action of the Lord. This is so often said that it is worth looking at it a little to see whether it means anything. The idea of communication is a complex rather than a simple notion. It may well be that Hebrew modes of thought stress the active element in this complex. But it is difficult to make any sense of an active disclosure which does not convey knowledge—both knowledge of essence and existence—and, if it be from God to man, does not also provoke and stimulate "numinous feelings". If this is in fact so, as Kittel admits, what is all the fuss about? When all the most graceful concessions have been made to those who point out the errors, the dangers and the limitations, of divine truth locked up in the scriptural image or in dogmatic formulas (or in liturgical patterns, though Dr Baillie nowhere seems to recognize these) it is still extremely difficult to see what sense can be given to the idea of a revelation which must never be expressed in any of the God-given forms which men use to store and to communicate truth. We have this treasure in earthen vessels, but it is no good just talking about how wonderful the treasure is. It must be stored, retained, given out. The Council of Trent is put up by Dr Baillie for mockery, because it reduced the divine revelation to the Apostles' Creed, the Sacraments, the Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer. Most of us would find that quite enough to get on with, and a number of pre-eminently saintly men and women have lived and died with little else. What is all this talk of revelation, as a sort of vague concept which floats about in the theological reviews? It cannot be true that the choice lies simply between the "vague" theory or the "propositional" theory. The dilemma has arisen from the confusion of those who have a weak doctrine of the Church. When Dr Farrer says, "This at least in modern thought upon the subject is true; the primary revelation is

Jesus Christ himself", he does not mean Christ considered merely as an invader into the historic past; or Christ as the source of a vivid religious experience at a particular moment of time now; but rather Christ in his body the Church now. At no point, so far as we can see, is this recognized by Dr Baillie. It is only in the light of it that many of the notorious utterances of Dr Temple, so often quoted against "propositions", are to be understood. "What is offered to man's apprehension in any specific revelation is not truth concerning God, but the living God himself" is a phrase which only becomes meaningful if we recognize the conception of the body of Christ in all the riches of that metaphor, type, image, symbol. But we are still his creatures and the living God has chosen to speak to us through these very basic images, signs and symbols. There is no other way by which we can give any sense to talk about divine encounter which is not just words without content. But revelation has as much a moral as an intellectual note. It tells us what we must do as well as what we must know.

So Dr Baillie realizes that all is not as clear as it might be in this notion of revelation being given in the form of events. In a single sentence he reveals the clue to the resolution of this continuing discussion. "The illumination of the receiving mind is a necessary condition of the divine self-disclosure." It would seem to be difficult to conceive of a human mind being illuminated by "revelation in general"; and we can agree with Richard Niebuhr when he says that the idea of "events-in-themselves" is as difficult to conceive as "things-in-themselves".

Dr Baillie's book does a good deal, therefore, to reveal that much incantatory language has been uttered in the last twenty years about this question of revelation; and everyone seems to have joined in chasing the tired old fox dubbed "propositional theology".

A rather ancient and feeble account of faith is quoted from the *Catholic Encyclopaedia* which ends on a strongly obediential note. Dr Baillie, who quotes Barth with approval on this obediential note in faith, omits to remark on the essential similarity between the two.

Whenever we are launched upon a discussion of faith it becomes increasingly clear that there is not a "catholic" idea of faith and a "protestant". There are rather a number of Christians who try to write about it who get confused. Thus in the attractive Puritan, John Flavel, writing in the seventeenth century, we can hear the very accents of Newman (who, oddly enough, is not mentioned in the whole book). It will be seen that there is a whole wealth of stimulus to theological discussion in this book, and its clarity and charity are as admirable as the deeply personal and evangelical note upon which it ends.

G. L. Phillips.

University of London.

SHORTER NOTICES

Studia Patristica. Edited by K. Aland and F. L. Cross. Akademie-Vertag, Berlin. DM. 96.

Professor F. L. Cross has distinguished himself, *inter alia*, by his organization of huge conventions and his editorship of encyclopedic works of scholarship. He has now produced in two volumes, in conjunction with Dr Aland, most of the papers delivered at the Second International Conference on Patristic Studies which he organized at Oxford in 1955. This was not merely an international but also an ecumenical banquet of learning. The richness and rarity of the ingredients together with the extravagant profusion of courses should satisfy the appetite, even if it overloads the digestion, of the most voracious of patristic gastronomes. These two volumes comprise 1,260 pages. Divided into 12 categories, there are 118 papers by 112 contributors in 5 languages (with the English language, but not English scholarship, predominating).

Articles range from such special subjects as "Excerpts of Titus of Bostra on the Coptic Catena of the Gospels" to more general themes like "Genèse et signification de la prière, aux origines chrétiennes". Although this reviewer cannot pretend to have read every word of this vast collection, it can confidently be recommended as a really important contribution to theology. Few individuals may be able to afford its price, but no serious library of patristics can afford to be without it. The standard of production is high, but it is hard to resist citing the heading of p. 193 (Part I) which reads "Local varitions of spelling . . ."

One fractious comment. I may not be very skilled with a paper-knife, but it took me nearly an hour to cut all the pages of these two volumes. While it may be said that anyone who is prepared to pay £8 for a work will also be prepared to cut its pages, the point should certainly be made that a person who pays that sum of money deserves to buy something ready for reading.

A third international conference on patristics is planned for 1959.

Hugh Montefiore.

Gonville and Caius College,
Cambridge.

Resurgent Religions. By S. Kulandran. Lutterworth Press. 2s.
Missionary Commitments of the Anglican Communion. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

Although a citizen of Ceylon, the home of the Colombo plan, and the negotiator of a recent agreement on bases with Great Britain which was a model of moral dealings between East and West, between a large and a small nation, Bishop Kulandran feels able to write of "the moral collapse of the Western nations". He characterizes the influence of Western nations in the Middle East in terms of

"row upon row of gleaming bayonets". He allows Japan to have been "as capable of meaningless sadism as any Western country". It is useful for us Western Christians to realize that responsible Eastern brethren still think, or at least feel, like this.

This anti-Western bias may account for the one defect of clarity in the book. Bishop Kulandran does not feel it necessary to add any note of explanation when he introduces such words as "privena", "dhamma", or "Theravadin", which might baffle a Western reader. Apart from this his book is an admirably clear and sympathetic short presentation of the resurgence of Buddhism, Hinduism and Islam, a subject of quite first-rate importance.

Dr Warren, who according to the Primate's preface is largely responsible for the other book, takes of course a different view. Profoundly aware of the "revolt of Asia and Africa against the West" he stoutly champions the British "doctrine of trusteeship in relation to dependent territories, a moral idea which was in due course to transform an Empire into a Commonwealth".

The report is masterly in its breadth and compression. In particular it makes clear the actual and potential effect on the missionary movement of the growth of American economic and political power.

Two points may be selected for question. Like most missionary strategists Dr Warren lays stress on the training of those who have heard the call to the ministry. This emphasis may need to be balanced by an equal emphasis on the role of the foreign missionary in sounding that call. This he may be particularly well equipped to do, as his comparative economic security should give him an attitude towards the vocation to the ministry which puts its economic disadvantages in their proper perspective.

Secondly, Dr Warren gives priority to "the training of hand-picked nationals", not least by sending them abroad. It must be spiritually most dangerous to know yourself and be known as a "hand-picked national" of any country, East or West; especially if the way to such eminence may appear to lie in the passing of examinations and the multiplying of degrees. Again, this emphasis may need to be balanced by an equal pre-occupation with the dangers of separating the "hand-picked" from the predominantly rural background of their church, and with the re-integration of those returning from abroad into the local situation.

I have not raised these questions very skilfully. May they at least serve to show the stimulation to be obtained from what at first sight might appear to be "just another report".

A. H. Dammers.

Sheffield.

Archbishop Garbett. By the Prioress of Whitby. Mowbray. 10s. 6d.

One clerical library where membership is open to the more educated ladies of the diocese reports a demand from these readers for

more biography of great ecclesiastical leaders—brief, factual, with pictures but not necessarily an index. Here is an excellent specimen of the *genre*; the well-known story of the progress from Portsea to Southwark, Winchester and York. The diction is old-fashioned, being clear, straightforward and usually grammatically passable. There are some pleasing (and some not so pleasing) selections from the family portrait album from babyhood to old age. The portrait emerges and there are a few fresh illustrative anecdotes of definite usefulness to ladies preparing an address for the diocesan Young Wives. Masculine readers will miss the stimulus which only much longer and more detailed biography can provide—a peep into the depths or behind the scenes. Who, for instance, was responsible for the suggestion, accepted by the archbishop, that £20,000 would suffice to save the church schools of Yorkshire? And so on; there is little light on the interior life and spiritual development. Still, if any Young Wife in our own more chaotic and distracted age should wish to discover the bare facts of a successful career nourished by the *Preces Privatae* of Bishop Andrewes this unpretentious biographical study may be a useful introduction to further reading.

W. G. Addison.

Britford, Wilts.

A Paraphrase of Ephesians. By S. C. Carpenter. Mowbrays. 3s.
Amos, Hosea and Micah. By Norman H. Snaith. Epworth Press. 9s. 6d.
The Epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians. By Leon Morris. Tyndale Press. 7s. 6d.
The Gospel according to Saint John. By C. C. Martindale. Longmans. 7s.
The Gospel of John. By William Barclay. Saint Andrew Press. Two vols, 12s. 6d. each; limp paper, 6s. each.

Apart from the Bible itself, no books are more important to the student or preacher than his commentaries. Few of us can afford to do without a good shelf-full, else our minds become cramped or our sermons lifeless. For this reason these new books are worth notice. None of them bears the imprint of a great mind, and none pretends to great originality, but they are not to be despised on that account. Commentaries by great theologians have their appeal and they have their limitations, particularly because of their authors' prejudices. None of these writers is entirely free from prejudice, but none is blinded by it.

The Anglican background of *A Paraphrase of Ephesians* is undisguised, but it does not obtrude overmuch. St Paul's six short chapters are expanded to some forty-four pages of paraphrase. There is some otiose writing, and sometimes the length of the paraphrase obscures the basic shape of the Epistle's argument. There are, however, many good illuminations, and the deliberate use of anachronism is generally felicitous, but occasionally a forced metaphor jars. A useful book

for a Bible-study group or for the student who wants his imagination stirred.

Dr Snaith's commentary is disappointing. I am tempted to repeat the schoolmaster's report: "I am sure he can do better than this." A really good scholar has produced a second-rate book. The aim of the commentary is to help the preacher who is "ill-equipped with the more advanced works of scholarship". But the preacher whom Dr Snaith has in mind is indeed a poor sort, who needs his sermons ready-made. So the commentary degenerates at times into a concordance or into a set of sermon-notes; for instance, Amos 7. 14 gives the cue for such a set of notes on "Shepherds", which ranges from David to Hermas, but which has very little to do with Amos. The over-frequent references to the Methodist Hymn Book (providing suitable hymns to accompany the sermons outlined?) and to the Adult School translation are of little value to one who has neither volume on his shelves.

Morris's *Thessalonians* is by contrast an admirable exegetical commentary, a model of what such a book can be. The notes bring out, as they should, the true meaning of the Greek, and previous editors are used freely and wisely. Points of textual criticism are treated with care (though the note on 2 Thess. 1. 10 is incomplete), but the book is not overloaded with them. Occasionally the editor's theological bias is visible, but not often. All that spoils this book is the intensely annoying habit of transliterating Greek words into English characters. This would serve to offend both Greek and Barbarian. May we plead with the general editor of this series to alter his policy on this matter?

Few readers of this journal are likely to derive much profit from Fr Martindale's commentary on St John's Gospel. It is based on the Douay Version with its imperfections both of translation and of Latin Original, and comment is occasionally stifled by the requirements of the censor. The schoolboys for whom this volume is intended are strange creatures; they can appreciate the nice distinction between a Greek Aorist and a Perfect, and they know by instinct what St John means by "the Jews", and yet they would not ask awkward questions about the raising of Lazarus or our Lord's apparent cowardice recorded in 7. 1; nor would the chronology of Holy Week vis-à-vis the Synoptists worry them. I find it difficult to follow Fr Martindale on many points of exegesis. As an example, in the parable of the Door of the Sheep (10. 7–10) there is in verse 9 "no allusion to salvation". What, then, is the point of the passage? But, most important of all, a study of the Gospel with this commentary would probably fail to give schoolboys an appreciation of the air of mystery and wonder with which St John writes; and unless that is discovered what is the point of reading St John?

The other commentary on the Fourth Gospel is pure gold, refined out of the works of Temple, Westcott, Bernard and many other writers. There is a wealth of illustration and anecdote, much of it from unusual sources. The excellent and well-balanced introduction sets the tone for the whole work, which is clearly and economically

written. There is enough here to satisfy one's spiritual reading for weeks, and an almost inexhaustible mine for the preacher. The critical scholar can find what he wants elsewhere, but all who "would see Jesus" will be helped by Dr Barclay.

Alan Rogers.

Madagascar.

The Old Religion. By J. L. C. Dart. S.P.C.K. 17s. 6d.

Perhaps most Anglicans, while aware that the way of the Church of England lies somewhere between the Pope and Dr Billy Graham, would welcome more light upon their whereabouts. This book will help them. If the parish priest, knowing that his congregation are unlikely to read it, would retail it to them in manageable quantities, he may be surprised at their interest and gratitude.

Canon Dart's view is that at the time of the Reformation the Church of England retained in all essentials the old religion, and is therefore the catholic church of this land. After a short summary of the historical background, he turns to the Prayer Book, that "unperfect Boke, culled and picked out of the Popish Dunghill", as the Elizabethan Puritans picturesquely described it. He takes a broad survey of our forms of worship, covering baptism, the holy communion, ordination, marriage, confirmation, absolution, the kalendar and the divine office. There is also a chapter on the Royal Supremacy. His views resemble those of the Spanish ambassador, Quadra, who in 1562 forwarded to the Pope a petition from English catholics that they might attend their parish churches, and who explained in a covering letter that the Prayer Book contained no impiety or false doctrine, although what concerned the merits and intercession of the saints had been omitted.

Two criticisms may be made. One can feel no confidence in the argument that Article XXVIII condemns, not the Tridentine doctrine of transubstantiation, but a popular version of it. Also, the brief chapter on "A House Divided" lacks urbanity. It is doubtless hard luck to find within the walls of the national church those with whom we cannot agree, but many who are proud to call themselves protestants are right in thinking that the establishment was meant to comprehend them. On the via media one must expect to travel in mixed company.

A. C. Scupholme.

Thurcaston, Leicester.

Christ and the Christian: A course of sermons on evangelism in the Church preached in the chapel of Pusey House. Mowbray. 3s.

With the possible exception of Barry Marshall's, not originally preached in the course, the sermons in this little volume would perhaps better be styled "Evangelistic Sermons" than "Sermons on Evangelism". The aim of the course seems to have been to extend

the work of Pusey House and to prove by example that anything Billy Graham can do the Catholic tradition has the power to do "in a wiser, more balanced, and more realistic way". The former aim was attained. Dr Farrer's outstanding sermon on "How do we know we have found Christ?" triumphantly proved the latter. It is to be feared, however, that some of the other six sermons, however eloquent, both fail to come to grips with the fundamental problems facing undergraduates, and use terms intelligible only to those already conversant with the Catholic tradition. Oh! that there were many to preach the fullness of the Catholic Faith in as refreshing, compelling and fundamental a manner as Dr Farrer!

M. A. Reardon.

Cuddesdon College.

A Guide for Spiritual Directors. By the author of *The Way*. Mowbray. 9s. 6d.

The anonymous author of *The Way* is by now well known to many through a series of small spiritual books he has published over the last thirty-five years. To many he is also known personally, for during the past forty years he has been one of the most-used guides and confessors in the Church of England, used by all sorts and conditions of men and women. He has distilled a generous measure of his wide experience and deep understanding into this surprisingly simple book.

Taking his cue from the Prayer Book exhortation the author expounds the work of a priest in spiritual direction as that of a physician rather than of a judge. He writes illuminating, but all too brief, chapters on diagnosis and treatment first of fear, then of sin. This approach will be revelation to many, but it is surely the correct order, theologically as well as psychologically; it needs to be developed further. There are again, short but shrewd chapters on the different dispositions of individuals in prayer, following von Hügel's classification, with extremely practical suggestions for their training. In these sections we may well ask for more, and may question the over-general reference to psychology and the formal use of the term "soul", but we suspect the author could well provide answers.

His answers are in part provided by the exercises in the hearing of confessions, which form nearly half the book. There is inevitably some artificiality about specimen confessions; it is difficult to touch the nerve centre of modern dreariness. These dozen are sensible and illuminating, and the answers show acute psychological and theological understanding. The apparent simplicity of the author is a simplicity of the depths, not of the surface.

We hope the author will bring more treasures out of his depths and give us a fuller book. We certainly need more guidance on this matter written in our own idiom. Flexibility and reticence are perhaps of the essence of English spirituality and maybe anonymity too. The anonymous author of *The Cloud of Unknowing* expounded a

deep and simple spirituality of few words. There are some signs that, as in the fourteenth century, there is to-day a living school of English spirituality. This simple book may well be a pointer to many; certainly it should be compulsory reading for all priests and ordinands of the Church of England. To refuse to offer "the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice", is to refuse to exercise the ministry as the Prayer Book presents it; to be shy about so deep a matter may be understandable if it is understood as a challenge; to be ignorant about it is inexcusable when such help as this is provided.

J. H. CHURCHILL.

KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: Paul Tillich, *Dynamics of Faith* (9s. 6d.).

BLACKFRIARS PUBLICATIONS: A. M. Sertillanges, O.P., *St Thomas Aquinas and his Work* [new edition] (10s. 6d.).

BLACKWELL: George L. Mosse, *The Holy Pretence* (21s.).

BURNS, OATES AND WASHBOURNE: Karl Adam, *The Christ of Faith* (30s.); S. J. P. van Kijk, O.F.M., and J. Hacelden Walker, *The Myth of the Aumbry* (10s. 6d.).

GEOFFREY CHAPMAN: Eugène Masure, *The Diocesan Priest* (18s.).

JAMES CLARKE AND CO.: Brother George Every, S.S.M., *Lamb to the Slaughter* (7s. 6d.).

CLONMORE AND REYNOLDS: P. J. McLaughlin, *The Church and Modern Science* (30s.).

EPWORTH PRESS: G. S. Wakefield, *Puritan Devotion: Its Place in the Development of Christian Piety* (21s.).

FONTANA BOOKS (COLLINS): Herbert Butterfield, *Christianity and History* [reviewed in THEOLOGY, April 1950, pp. 151 f.] (2s. 6d.); J. B. Phillips, *The Gospels in Modern English* [Mr Phillips' well-known translation of the Gospels now available in a cheap edition] (2s. 6d.).

ROBERT HALE: James Benson, *Prisoner's Base and Home Again* (15s.).

LIBRERIA EDITRICE FIORENTINA: Arrigo Levasti (Ed.), *Beato Giovanni Dominici, O.P.: Trattato Delle Dieci Questioni e Lettere a Madonna Bartolomea* (950 lire).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: *Services proposed for use at the Inauguration of the Church of North India and the Church of Pakistan and the service for the Ordination of Presbyters* [Revised 1957].

MACMILLAN: G. R. Beasley-Murray, *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen* (18s.).

MOWBRAY: Henry de Candole, *Headings for the Lessons* [Brief introductions to the lessons for Year 2 in the 1955 lectionary] (3s. 6d.); Dewi Morgan, *The Bishops Come to Lambeth* (7s. 6d. and 5s.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: F. L. Cross (Ed.), *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (70s.); C. N. Cochrane, *Christianity and Classical Culture* [new edition] ($2.95).

ST MARK'S LIBRARY PUBLICATIONS (CANBERRA): Leicester Webb, *The Conciliar Element in the Anglican Tradition* (n.p.).

S.C.M. PRESS: *The Notebooks of Florence Allshorn* (8s. 6d.); Oliver Tomkins, *The Life of Edward Woods* (25s.); H. E. Fosdick, *The Living of These Days* (25s.).

SHEED AND WARD: J. Donceel, S.J., *Philosophical Psychology* (21s.).

S.P.C.K.: A. T. Hanson, *The Wrath of the Lamb* (25s.); C. M. Duncan-Jones, *Trusty and Well Beloved* (18s. 6d.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON

some Frontier books

REMBRANDT AND THE GOSPEL

The biblical message of Rembrandt's art

W. A. VISSER 'T HOOFT, General Secretary of the World Council of Churches *illustrated* 25s net

RELIGIOUS LANGUAGE

An Empirical Placing of Theological Phrases

IAN T. RAMSEY, Nolloth Professor of the Philosophy of the Christian Religion in the University of Oxford, and Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford 18s net

THE MEANING OF PERSONS

A practising physician and psychologist enquires into the nature of personality

PAUL TOURNIER, translated by Edwin Hudson 21s net

TECHNICS AND PURPOSE

A series examining the issues arising out of the growing importance of scientific techniques in our society, and the rapid expansion of technological and other education.

1 **Scientific and Technological Education**

EDWIN BARKER, Assistant General Secretary, National Council of YMCAs

2 **Technical Education: An Appraisal**

H. A. WARREN, Principal, S.E. London Technical College

3 **Science and Existence**

ALAN RICHARDSON, Professor of Christian Theology, University of Nottingham

4 **Purpose in Teacher Training**

MONICA WINGATE, Principal of Balls Park Training College, Hertford

2s 6d net each

SCM PRESS

*Announcing a New Impression**

of "the most important and most widely read and discussed book on the Doctrine of the Ministry in the Church written in our time."

The Apostolic Ministry

Essays on the History and Doctrine of the Episcopacy, edited by

The late K. E. KIRK, Bishop of Oxford

"Here Churchmen will find the plain but exhilarating truth about an institution which is fundamental to their Churchmanship. They will discover, likewise, what about it is essential, and what is incidental, accidental, or plainly disastrous. If non-episcopalians want to know something of what Catholic episcopacy really means, we beg them not to enquire of the episcopate—whose members are not always at their unclouded best in answering such a question—but to procure this book."

The Church Times

* *With a new foreword by* **A. M. FARRER, D.D.**

Published at 42/- net by **HODDER AND STOUGHTON,** *who also have the honour to publish and recommend Professor T. W. Manson's presentation of the 'dissenting' view of the subject*—"THE CHURCH'S MINISTRY" (8/6 net)

HODDER AND STOUGHTON